

Application No. 09/770,767
Amendment "A" dated February 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed December 16, 2004

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on February 9, 2005. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The first Office Action, mailed December 16, 2004, considered and rejected claims 84-86, 94-11 and 128-131.¹

By this paper, claims 87-93 and 112-127, which were previously withdrawn² have been cancelled, such that claims 94-11 and 128-131 remain pending. Of these claims, claims 94 and 128 are the only independent claims at issue.

As discussed during the interview, the claims are generally directed to embodiments for generating a compressed video stream. In claim 94, the recited method includes generating, with a program, a plurality of display commands which represents a display. At least one of the display commands is then modified, independently of the program that generated them and in such a way that the modified display command will be easier to compress than the display command prior to being modified. Then, a compressed video stream is generated using the display commands and the modified display command.

Claim 128 is also directed to a method for generating a compressed video stream. In claim 128, however, the recited method includes executing a program to generate a set of display commands that are representative of a display. Changes in the display that result from a user command are then identified. It is then determined whether said changes warrant an update to an image. If they do, the changes are processed and the display commands are then converted into a compressed video stream, wherein said changes are inserted into said compressed video stream at a higher frame rate than other changes in said display.

¹ Claim 84 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Noro (U.S. Patent No. 6,646,677). Claims 85-86 and 94-99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noro. Claims 100-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noro in view of Bulman (U.S. Patent No. 5,623,587). Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Claims were withdrawn in a telephonic communication in response to a telephonic Restriction Requirement communicated with Eric Kamerath on 11/23/04.

Application No. 09/770,767
Amendment "A" dated February 7, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed December 16, 2004

The new dependent claims 132 and 133 also clarify that the compressed video stream is generated without first generating a display raster of the display commands. This ~~claim~~ limitation was extracted from cancelled claim 84.

Support for the claim amendments, as discussed during the interview, generally ~~comes~~ from paragraphs 160-191. Some support is also found in paragraphs 14-27, 50-56, 84, 94, as well as other portions of the specification.

As discussed during the interview, the cited art fails, either singly or in combination to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. In particular, Noro and Bulman fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, that display commands are generated by a program, and then subsequently modified independently of the program and in such a way that they are easier to compress than they were prior to being modified, and then generating a compressed video stream with the display commands, including the modified commands. (claim 94) The art also fails to disclose a system in which it is determined whether changes to display commands warrant an update to an image (claim 128).

The foregoing is particularly true when considering that the modifications can include such things as replacing objects (claim 100) such as text (claim 102), backgrounds (claim 103), fonts (claim 105), colors (claim 106), or where modifications include reducing spatial resolutions (claims 107, 109), color ranges (claim 108), or where modifications include replacing the objects with compressed objects (claim 101). This is also true when considering that the display commands can include such things as scroll commands and modifications can include the increasing a granularity of the scrolling (claim 110) by limiting scrolling commands to multiples of compression blocks in the compressed stream (claim 111) and wherein the changes comprise an indication of a selection of a GUI (claim 130), as claimed.

Instead, as discussed during the interview, Noro is generally directed to methods and systems improving the camera recording and transmissions involving the pan and tilt of cameras and for altering compression ratios to help prevent jitter and reduce lag effects. (Col. 1, ll. 10-15; Col. 2, ll. 24-51, Col. 3, ll. 18-31, Col. 4, ll. 14-20).

Bulman, on the other hand, is directed to improved methods and systems for superimposing and replacing portions of images, such as replacing the head of a human for the head of an animal. The Bulman methods involve the creation of several images to provide the appropriate scaling and superimposition. (Col. 2, ll. 13-61). Bulman also teaches that

Application No. 09/770,767
Amendment "A" dated February 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed December 16, 2004

techniques can be used to color map and to change colors and shade in synchronization with background changes and to perform morphing. (Col. 6, ll. 1-4; Col. 9, ll. 37-52).

These references do not, however, teach or suggest that display commands are generated by a program, and then subsequently modified independently of the program and in such a way that they are easier to compress than they were prior to being modified, and then generating a compressed video stream with the display commands, including the modified commands or for determining whether changes to display commands warrant an update to an image.

In fact, as described during the interview, it is just as likely that any changes made to images according to Bulman could potentially make it more difficult to compress an image. Furthermore, the cited art also clearly fails to teach or suggest that the compressed video stream is generated without first generating a display raster of the display commands, as recited in the new dependent claims.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are distinguished from and allowable in view of the cited art of record. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 17 day of February, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\14531\107.1.3\M0000005574\V001.DOC